A SUMMER-FALL ECOLOGICAL RECONNAISSANCE OF THE BIG CYPRESS BAYOU WATERSHED, TEXAS AND LOUISIANA

Prepared by: William J. Sheffield, Ph.D.

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department 4200 Smith School Road Austin, Texas 78744



In cooperation with and funded by:

Department of the Army
Fort Worth District - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Post Office Box 17300
Fort Worth. Texas 76102-0300

. ..many of the diverse wildernesses out of which we have hammered America are gone.

No living man will see again the long-grass prairie, where a sea of prairie flowers lapped at the stirrups of the pioneer.

No living man will see again the virgin pineries of the Lake States or the flatwoods of the Coastal Plain, or the giant hardwoods;

of these, samples of a few acres each will have to suffice...

Aldo Leopold (1949)



"A sample of the past." Harrison Bayou, Harrison County Texas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMM	ARY	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	vii
ACKNOWLEDGEME	NTS		x
LIST	OF	TABLES	xi
LIST	OF	FIGURES	xii
PREFACE	01	TIGORES	xvi
	L D. D. J.		
	AREA		I
OBJECTIVES 4			
PROCEDURES 5			
c o Maps Physica Ecologi Land and Mapping	v e r and Aerial Ph l and Biological cal Reconna d Cover Class	Classification	5 6 7 8 8
FINDINGS AND DISC	USSION		12
Waterbodie Stre Rese Swa Mar Floodplain Bott Shre Terraces as	es and Their Perimeters . sams	Drests	171823242730303435
Unm Man Shru Grasslands Cropland Developed Urbs	nanaged hardwood forests haged pine forests haged pine forests had below the common terraces and terraces are terraces and terraces and terraces are terraces are terraces and terraces are terraces are terraces are terraces and terraces are terraces are terraces are terraces and terraces are t	<u>uplands</u> l sites	, 37 , 40 , 42 , 45 , 47

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

		<u>Page</u>
	Special Attention Plant Communities Bald cvpress swamp Bald cvpress-water tupelo swamp Water oak-willow oak bottomland Shortleaf pine-oak upland Bluejack oak-wst oak upland Unique Plant Communities Within Cover Types Bamboo-sweetgum Smooth alder swamp	. 49 . 49 . 49 . 52 . 52 . 53
CONSID	DERATIONS	. 55
	ogical Considerations and Land Use	55 . 60
REFERE	ENCES	66
APPEND	DICES	75
A.	Memorandum of Agreement Between Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.	A-l
В.	Survey Point Locations. Big Cypress Bayou Watershed Ecological Reconnaissance, June - October, 1994. B	1
C.	Satellite Imagery Map of the Big Cypress Bayou Watershed Based on 1994 Ground Truthing. Big Cypress Bayou Watershed Reconnaissance, June - July, 1994.	C-l
D.	Big Cypress Bayou Ecological Reconnaissance Field Data Form. D	1
E.	Statistical Tests and Testing Rational for Assignment of Wildlife Habitat Value (WHV) and Ecological Quality Rankings (EQR) to Select Cover Types. Big Cypress Bayou Watershed Ecological Reconnaissance, June - October, 1994. E	1
F.	Plants and Animals Listed in Literature Reviewed as Occurring in the Big Cypress Bayou Watershed, and Those Found to Characterize the Cover Types. Ecological Reconnaissance, June - October, 1994.	F-l
G.	Natural Plant Communities in the Big Cypress Bayou Watershed Listed by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department as Requiring Special Attention. G	1
Н.	Plants and Animals that Occur in the Big Cypress Bayou Watershed Listed by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and/or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as Rare. Threatened, and Endangered.	1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A June - October, 1994 ecological reconnaissance was made of the Big Cypress Bayou Watershed by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. Four thousand square miles (67%) of the Watershed was traversed. The reconnaissance area included that part of the Watershed in Caddo Parish, Louisiana and Miller County, Arkansas, west to its headwaters in Hopkins, Wood, and Franklin Counties, Texas. Major land and cover types were identified, located geographically, and characterized ecologically. The purpose was to facilitate U.S. Army Corps of Engineers cover mapping and provide ecological information for a comprehensive data base which is being prepared. The data will aid long-range natural resource and socio-economic planning.

Five land types, 18 cover types, 2 sub-types, 5 plant communities that are declining and in need of special attention, and 2 unique plant communities were encountered. Pine-hardwood forests, grasslands, and bottomland hardwood forests (including shrub-dominated bottomlands) cover 30%, 25%, and 17% of the reconnaissance area, respectively. Shrub-dominated uplands cover 9% of the area, managed pine forests 8%, upland hardwood forests 4%, waterbodies 3%, and croplands 2%. The remaining 2% includes developments, surfaced roads, bare ground, and areas not identified. Watershed wetlands (waterbodies and bottomland hardwood forests), unmanaged pine-hardwood forests, shrub-dominated upland, old fields, managed pine forests, pine plantations, and pastures and hay fields were principal cover types compared in order to help understand their ecological roles. Vegetation structural diversity, plant and animal species richness, and wildlife habitat value (WHV) assessments provided an ecological quality ranking (EQR) for each type. The EQR ranking of cover types is in the order listed above. WHV was a subjective assessment. Plant structural diversity and species richness statistically explained 86% of the ecological variability among types. Vegetation diversity received strong emphasis. The more structurally diverse and rich in species the vegetation, the greater the number of animal species found. Waterbodies, hardwood forests, and pine-hardwood uplands are Watershed cover types found to be more diverse and

rich in species. Diversity and richness of pine forests and merchantable-age plantations depended on their age and management. Cumulatively, they are less diverse and less rich in species than the other forests. Disturbed land with natural vegetation and young planted pine up to 15 ft. tall was classed as **shrub**-dominated uplands. Those **shrublands** lack vegetation structural diversity but they are rich in plant species, and are used by numerous **animals**. Pastures and hay fields are lowest in diversity and richness of the <u>vegetated</u> lands. Old fields are intermediate in richness among all cover **types** and are more diverse than the **other** grasslands.

Certain small sub-types may have the highest natural productivity. Marshes were judged to be among the most productive. Beavers have created most of the small marshes observed. Benefits provided by beavers should be evaluated thoroughly and weighed against their damaging actions.

Thirty-one percent and 32% of the plant and animal species, respectively, found in lists for the Watershed, were encountered during summer-fall. Signs of the river otter, a unique mammal on the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department's Watch List for possible decline in number, was recorded on two occasions. Several species of birds that are declining were observed. Of nine special attention plant communities listed for the Watershed, bald cypress swamp, bald cypress-water tupelo swamp, water oakwillow oak bottomland, shortleaf pine-oak upland, and bluejack oak-post oak upland communities were encountered. Unique plant communities encountered were bamboo-sweetgum and smooth alder stands.

The reconnaissance enabled a seasonal ecological characterization of the Watershed and assessment of the condition and ecological role of major cover types. Too few observations could be made within the constraints of this work for assessment of all types and communities. This was the case particularly with aquatic habitats, upland hardwood forests, special attention plant communities, and zones of interface between types (edge). Additional sampling done seasonally throughout one or more annual cycles is needed for more thorough assessments and to strengthen the reliability of findings.

Socio-economic initiatives commensurate with protection of the natural quality are prescribed for the Watershed. Cultural, educational, and recreational pursuits are under consideration. Ecotourism is touted. Most of the rural Watershed, however, must rely on conservation measures and efficient land management enterprises to protect the natural quality and bolster the economy. Considerations suggested to accomplish these needs are:

- ◆ abrogate illegal solid waste dumping and effluent discharges into Watershed streams.
- ◆ accomplish diversified cover restoration on lignite mine sites. Evaluate the development of commercial native plant nurseries on reconstituted sites as a means to mitigate the ecological degradation, generate income, and create jobs. Consider mine operator, landowner, lessee, or cooperative nursery enterprises.
- accomplish restoration of native plant cover on abandoned iron ore mine sites
- support current efforts to secure tax advantages for conservation and wildlife management, as is done for other agricultural enterprises.
- ◆ implement multiple use management on rangelands to increase land use efficiency and income. Combinations of lease hunting, cattle grazing, and forestry may be applicable. Include management to increase the quality and quantity of rangeland forage. Consider hunting income options that provide the most revenue.
- encourage the restoration, or leaving, of native cover strips and patches on mine sites, large grasslands, and clearcuts.
- expand current reservoir water release management planning so as to minimize bank erosion down-stream, and optimize protection of all native plants and animals that inhabit stream flood zones.
- help provide long-range protection of the Watershed's natural qualities via a cooperative watershed-tide environmental monitoring program. A consortium of public officials, natural resource agencies, municipalities, educational institutions, students, student mentors, companies, organizations, and individuals could conduct monitoring and accomplish hands-on citizen participation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Most Americans understand the benefits derived from economic development better than the benefits from healthy natural environments. The truth is that both are needed for the good quality of life often ascribed only to development. Provisions for both were called for in the 1993 Cypress Bayou Watershed proposal by U.S. Congressman Jim Chapman and Texas Parks and Wildlife Department. The proposal calls for developmental and environmental initiatives together and is exemplary for the Nation. Congressman Chapman, State and federal entities, local municipalities and organizations, and private citizens who supported the effort are hereby congratulated.

The ecological reconnaissance presented herein was one of several studies planned to provide baseline information for the Watershed initiatives. Many individuals helped and their time, support, and specific inputs are sincerely appreciated.

TEXAS PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT

Administrative Support	Data Management	Field Investigations
James A. Neal Karen A. Leslie Susan E. Carroll	James A. Neal Susan E. Carroll Raymond C. Telfair II, Ph.D.	Carl D.Frentress Raymond C. Telfair II, Ph.D. Mary M. Parker
Larry D. McKinney, Ph.D. Steve Luttrell	Matthew C. Mays	Michael J. Ryan Robert Ramirez Marvin Rhodes
Field Support	Report Review	Charlie Muller
James A. Neal Thomas E. Pritchard Shirley Lee Cage	James A Neal Susan E. Carroll Karen A. Leslie	Kile Fitch, Jr. Delanne E. Pruitt Matthew C. Mays
Audie R. Irvin	Carl D. Frentress Raymond C. Telfair II, Ph.D.	Design and Layout
Document Preparation	Mary M. Parker	Susan E. Carroll
Susan E. Carroll William J. Sheffield , Ph.D . Gwen K. Beasley	Matthew C. Mays Gwen K. Beasley	Photographs William J. Sheffield , Ph.D.

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT

Thomas J. Cloud, Jr., U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Mary J. Flores, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers G. Ishmael Williams, Jr., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

LIST OF TABLES

<u> Table</u>							<u>Page</u>
1.	Closest match of applicable	of descriptors a to the	among five o	cover classific Cypress	ations Bayou	Watershed.	9
2.	Land and cover ecological	r types. Big Cy reconnai	-	u Watershed June-Oc	ctober,	1994.	11
3.	Wildlife habitat of eight major of Bayou Watersh	cover types bas	ed on five e	ecological mea	sures. Big C	ypress	3
4.	Two-way analysecological mea		-	-		s five een type mean	as. 14
5.	Approximate ac in major cover			U			4. 17
6.	Forage yield inc Texas and Louis	•	• •	• • •	•		33
7.	Forage use indicate Bayou	ces for white-ta	ailed deer ar Watershee			angeland.	33
8.	A representative optimum catt	• •		•			62
9.	Assessment and Big	ranking of acc		ge for white-ta Sayou	iiled deer. Waters	shed.	64

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>							<u>Page</u>
1.	Location	of	Big	Cypress	Bayou	Watershed.	1
2.		chness. Big		ed on their plan Bayou Watershe June-October	d ecological	versity 1994.	14
3.	•	sted in litera	ature review	observed durin wed. Big Cypre 1	~		6
4.	_		_	observed by co			6
5.				pper Little Cypr			. 19
6.	•		•	k, Upshur Cou only found	•	e garbage eam crossings	19
7.			•	nt biologists sei Bayou, Harrison	•	2	0
8.		-		County, TX w ison Bayou		County, TX.	20
9.				Bayou east of Jo			. 21
10.				immediately be unty, TX			22
11.	Caddo Lake	e, Clinto	n Lake	component,	Marion	County, TX.	24
12.	Shrub edge ber Big Cypr			land and open oodplain,		ounty, TX.	25
13.	•	watered shr i Lake	ıb swamp complex,	(background) w Marion	ithin the County	, TX.	25
14.	_	-		ming on James	-	lain,	26
15.			•	ated with a bra		reek,	. 27

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

Figure		<u>Page</u>
16.	Marsh created by beaver damming on a branch of Black Bayou, Miller County, AR	28
17.	Marshy edge on Lake O' The Pines, Marion County, TX	28
18.	Large marsh associated with Black Bayou east of Oil City, Caddo Parish, LA.	29
19.	Percent vegetation cover on bottomland hardwood forest observed June-October, 1994, Big Cypress Bayou Watershed	30
20.	Bottomland hardwood forest on a narrow floodplain of upper Little Cypress Bayou, Franklin County, TX.	32
21.	Bottomland hardwood forest on a broad floodplain within the Caddo Lake complex, Marion County, TX.	32
22.	Shrub-dominated floodplain in Marion County, TX. The site was cleared for pasture and not maintained. Shrub regrowth is predominately buttonbush	34
23.	Heavily cutover, unmanaged pine-hardwood upland. Cass County, TX. 3	5
24.	Unmanaged pine-hardwood forest-loblolly pine dominant. Hopkins County, TX.	36
25.	Percent vegetation cover on unmanaged pine-hardwood forest observed June-October, 1994, Big Cypress Bayou Watershed.	36
26.	Naturally regenerated loblolly pine forest under management. Harrison County, TX	38
27.	Young merchantable age loblolly pine plantation. Morris County, TX. 3	8
28.	Managed shortleaf pine on dry upland. Morris County, TX. 3	9
29.	Percent vegetation cover on managed pine forests observed June - October, 1994. Big Cypress Bayou Watershed. 3	9
30.	Shrub regeneration on a large clearcut pine-hardwood upland, Caddo Parish, LA. 4	0

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
31.	Sub-merchantable age loblolly pine plantation classed as shrub-dominated upland. Big Cypress Bayou Watershed ecological reconnaissance. Upshur C o u n t y TX	41
32.	Shrub-dominated upland (clearcut and burned). Upshur County, TX.	41
33.	Large irrigated hay field. Camp County, TX.	43
34.	Lignite mining, Titus County, TX. Originally pine-hardwood upland forest, this land is being reconstituted and planted in non-native grasses.	43
35.	Old field on pine-hardwood upland, Cass County, TX Note the encroachment of pine seedlings.	44
36.	Percent vegetation cover on old fields observed June - October, 1994, Big Cypress Bayou Watershed.	45
37.	Golf course near Longview, TX. A type of urban-suburban area used by a variety of wildlife	8
38.	Large iron ore mine site, Morris County, TX	. 8
39.	Typical permanently watered bald cypress swamp. Caddo Lake complex, Marion County, TX	50
40.	$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	50
41.	Beaver lodge on Clinton Lake component of Caddo Lake, Marion County, TX.	51
42.	Bald cypress-water tupelo swamp community on James Bayou, Caddo Parish, LA_	51
43.	Water oak-willow oak bottomland hardwood community, Big Cypress Bayou floodplain, Upshur County, TX	52
44.	Shortleaf pine-oak community, Camp County, TX.	53
45.	Unique bamboo-sweetgum community, Camp County, TX.	54
46.	Shrub-herb covered drainage that provides a protective corridor and edge habitat for wildlife, Gregg County, TX.	57

LIST OF FIGURES (continued)

						Page
(background) that	at provide co	over patchiness an	id edge div	versity high	ly	57
Low-quality	edge	associated	with	some	development.	58
often occurs on e	edges. The p	ollution that resu	lts threate	ns human h		9
dumped solid wa	ste contains	toxic materials th	at are intr	oduced into	the	50
	(background) the beneficial to will Low-quality Illegal dumping often occurs on eand reduces the attraction of the pollution dumped solid was	(background) that provide cobeneficial to wildlife	(background) that provide cover patchiness are beneficial to wildlife. Low-quality edge associated Illegal dumping associated with urban sprawl often occurs on edges. The pollution that result and reduces the aesthetic and ecological integral. Type of pollution associated with urban-suburdumped solid waste contains toxic materials the	(background) that provide cover patchiness and edge disbeneficial to wildlife. Low-quality edge associated with Illegal dumping associated with urban sprawl and huma often occurs on edges. The pollution that results threate and reduces the aesthetic and ecological integrity of nata Type of pollution associated with urban-suburban sprawdumped solid waste contains toxic materials that are introduced.	(background) that provide cover patchiness and edge diversity high beneficial to wildlife. Low-quality edge associated with some Illegal dumping associated with urban sprawl and human traffic often occurs on edges. The pollution that results threatens human hand reduces the aesthetic and ecological integrity of natural environ. Type of pollution associated with urban-suburban sprawl. Some ill dumped solid waste contains toxic materials that are introduced into	

PREFACE

This report covers tasks listed in Section IV, H, and I of the Memorandum of Agreement between Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE) for studies of the Big Cypress Bayou Watershed (Appendix A). The project time frame initially was April, 1994 through February, 1995. Field work began in June, 1994 immediately following administrative actions necessary to proceed. Subsequently, the completion date was extended through September, 1995. The overriding purpose of this reconnaissance was to comply with prescriptions in the proposal for Caddo Lake and the associated Watershed that call for assurance of the ecological integrity, traditional use options, information to aid long-range planning, and community involvement (Chapman-Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, 1993). Assurance of the Watershed's ecological integrity is taken herein as planning and management actions to optimize the quality and well-being of the living natural resources over the long-term. Living natural resources are defined as native plants and animals and the habitats on which they rely. They may sometimes be referred to as natural resources, or resources.